6. Discussion on the Resolution seeking approval to the rejection of the Award of Board of Arbitration on OTA as required under the JCM Scheme.

7. Discussion on the Resolution seeking approval of the rejection of the Award of Board of Arbitration on upward revision of pay scale in the grade of Stenographer Grade D in CA reference number 11 of 1992.

8. Discussion on the Resolution seeking approval to the rejection of the Award of Board of Arbitration for grant of Special Pay to Private Secretaries (merged grades 'A' and 'B' of CSSS) in CA reference number 2 Of 1991.

RE. REPLY BY FINANCE MINISTER ON UTI DEBATE

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): With your permission, Sir, I would like to raise an issue with respect to the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha, in this House during the course of discussion on the UTI issue. As you know, Sir, during the course of that discussion, the Members of this House, especially on this side, raised issues regarding the fact that the hon. Finance Minister was informed by the ex-Chairman of the UTI, Shri Subramanyam, as to the state of affairs of the UTI. The hon. Minister responded to it and accepted that, in fact, two letters were written on the 18th May and 30th June, but said that no demand was made by the ex-Chairman of the UTI and nothing really relevant was stated in those letters. In response to the other questions raised by Members of this House, as to what happened on the 2nd July, the Minister stated that on the 30lh June, when the letter was received by the Finance Ministry, he was informed about it only on the morning of the 2nd July. He admitted that he met Shri Subramanyam, but then he stated that as far as the decision as to what was to happen to the US-64, that was left to the Board of Trustees of the UTI, and that he intervened in the matter only after the Board of Trustees took a decision. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, Sir, and I should say this with consternation that in a news report published in the *Business Standard* on the 4lh August, there is a quotation from the bail application of Shri Subramanyam in which he states something entirely contrary to what has been stated by the Finance Minister in this House, and I quote: "The former Chairman of the Unit Trust of India, Shri Subramanyam, in his bail application today before the Special Judge has claimed that he had apprised the Government on 18th May and June 30th about the state of affairs in the UTI." This is one statement. Then, I am quoting from the bail

application, "Left with no alternative, even after indicating the same to the Government, a proposal was made to the Finance Secretary by a letter dated 30m June by the petitioner..." -- petitioner, being Mr. Subramanyam. "In order to further apprise the Finance Minister of the said situation, the bail application has stated that Mr. Subramanyam also met the Finance Minister on 2nl1 July;" Who advised the petitioner? It says: "The Finance Minister advised the petitioner to go ahead with the scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees on the same day in Delhi for either to announce US-64 at the base price or to suspend sale and repurchase." Shri Subramanyam, in his bail application, as reported in the newspaper, has clearly said that the Finance Minister advised him to either announce US-64 at the base price or to suspend sales and re-purchase. Now, I would like to read the statement of the Minister in this House. As regards the meeting on the 2nd July, he said, "If we had been kept in the picture, if he had come to us, then we would have told him what exactly had to be done. After all, if we could solve the uroblem after 2nd July, why could we not have solved the problem before 2nd July? It was not because of lack of any desire or will on the part of the Finance Ministry. It was entirely because, deliberately, we were kept in the dark. It was for this reason, it was for this failure, and it was for this weakness, that on the 3rd July, we decided that the Chairman of the UTI must put in his papers." I further quote, *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM (Uttaranchal) : Sir, what is the issue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have permitted him.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh) : Is he moving a Privilege Motion?

MR, CHAIRMAN: He has taken permission from me. I have permitted him and then the Government will respond.

SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI: Is it a Privilege Motion? *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it is not a Privilege Motion. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL I have taken the permission of the Chair.

Sir, secondly, on what strength does the Ministry of Finance interfere at this stage and ask the UTI to do one and not the other? "We, therefore, decided" -- 'it may be an error of judgment; I don't know; but at that point of

time, that was the judgment that we made in the Ministry of Finance' -- "to intervene only after the UTI Board had taken the decision. We intervened only after the UTI board took the decision in its wisdom". If you read the statement of Mr. Subramanyam made in the application, as reported in the Press and what the hon. Finance Minister stated in the House, I do believe that it would be appropriate for the Finance Minister to make a statement in this House in respect of the averments made and reported in the Press on this issue because there is an apparent contradiction between what he stated in the application and what is stated in this House and, therefore, we request the hon. Finance Minister and the Government to make this position clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI: Sir, the Finance Minister only gave the sequence of events. ... *(Interruptions)...* I don't think there is any contradiction involved in the *...(Interruptions)...*

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री संतोष गंगावार): सभापति जी यह विषय ऐसा है कि इस पर नित्य ही नए-नए समाचार समाचारपत्रों के माध्यम से और अन्य माध्यमों से जानकारी में आ रहे हैं । मैं समझता हूं कि वित्त मंत्री जी बहुत सतर्क हैं । जैसे ही उन्हेयह जानकारी मिलेगी निश्चित रूप से वे इस संदर्भ में आवश्यक कार्यवाही करेंगे और यदि सदन को बताना आवश्यक होगा तो वे बताएंगे । मैं माननीय सदस्य और सदन की भावना से उनको आज ही अवगत करवा दुंगा।

SPECIAL MENTIONS

Private Armies

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): Sir, over the last two years, attempts are being made by some sectarian organisations to raise private armies. Training camps have been organised by them in different parts of the country where young men and women are trained in the use of guns and swords as well as martial arts. Private armed militias represent a threat to peace and tranquillity and are not permitted under the Indian Constitution. The Arms Act, 1959 expressly prohibits the possession of arms by private parties without a license. I, therefore, urge Government to put an end to these blatantly illegal and provocative camps, seize the illegally held arms and, if necessary, arrest the masterminds organising these camps.